Reviewer A:
>
> Paper Number:
>   4004
>
>
> Purpose - Comments
>
> Goals, Objectives, Rationale, Research Question, Hypothesis
> :
>   The Rationale as stated on page 5 of submitted document is a single
> sentence; thus, the rationale is not fully developed and does not seem
> consistent with the aims of the study.  The Rationale could be more
> fully developed and stated.

***Authors’ response****: The rationale was revised by taking the suggestion from reviewer two and placing the paragraph into this portion of the manuscript*
>
> The purpose of the study is twofold: determine if VMM is an effective
> mechanism/system for mentoring and determine if VMM is an effective
> mechanism/system for teaching skills and strategies.  The paper does
> develop from this purpose to cover both those aspects in fair detail.

***Authors’ response****: The term “two-fold” was added since two ideas were developed. The authors also added the term “system” to the purpose of the study to clarify that we are using the system rather than developing the system/platform itself.*
>
>
> Background - Comments
>
> Theoretical Framework, Literature Review
> :
>   The Literature Review is adequate.  Sources are current and relevant.
>
> The Theoretical Framework is a mentoring model developed by the researchers.
> No evidence is provided that the model is valid and/or reliable;
> rather, it is a model assumed to be valid by its use in the study.  In
> this regard, the study is much more action research oriented rather
> than broadly generalizable to other populations.  (One piece of
> evidence here is the inclusion of Moodle as the learning management system included in the model.

> A broad model would not dictate the system to be used.)
>

***Author’s Response****: We added information showing that 1)videoconferencing has been previously blended with learning support systems such as Moodle, and phone conferencing to support learners and 2)we noted the outcomes in the “introduction of the literature review” of such a blending. We also added that using the format on a different subject (adjuncts) would add to the body to see if it would be successful for mentoring.*
>
> Methodology - Comments
>
> Participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis
> :
>   The n for the study is, at best, 2: the mentor and the mentee. This
> is quite limiting.  There was little structure for the data collection
> described in the study.  Researches indicated that videos, logs, and
> surveys were used to gather data, but no indication was provided as to
> the protocol for log writing, survey instruments were not provide nor
> were even descriptive statistics from survey items, and no protocols
> for reviewing videos were provided.
>
> Beyond the "constant comparative" methodology, no description of data
> analysis procedures was provided in the report.

***Authors’ response****: Information was added to explain the protocol for the collection of data (survey and logs) and how they were*

*utilized by the researchers to support the mentoring process.*

*A “participant” section was added to clearly state the participants of the case study.*

*The video recordings were not used for data collection. Instead they were used to validate that each participant was behaving in their roles as noted in the protocol.*

*This a case study. Therefore, we expect the n value to be low. Also this is an innovative study because mentoring has not been done within this context. Therefore, this is a prototype study.*
>
>
> Findings - Comments
>
> Data summaries, Statistical significance, assertions, themes
> :
>   The Findings section seems disjointed: the researchers point out
> that data "polarized int tow major areas: mentoring and quality
> control and videoconferencing as a tool to mentor."  The 'quality
> control' aspect seems fairly well developed and discussion feels
> consistent with what this reviewer would assume the study would discover.
>
> The 'videoconferencing as mentoring tool' section, however, seems to
> lack deep discussion of how BOTH the mentor and mentee felt about the process.
> There is some discussion from the full-time faculty member's
> perspective, but no detailed discussion from the adjunct faculty
> perspective is provided apart from the full time faculty section.
>
> There is ample discussion of the need for "good technology" in all
> synchronous communication environments, but this reviewer did not find
> a clear connection to how technology issues impacted the mentor/mentee
> relationship.  There was clear discussion how technology issues
> affected the actual teaching of the course that led to the use of
> co-teaching situations to overcome technology issues; however, this
> reviewer did not find those discussion germane to the study.

***Authors’ Response****: The evaluator of the project reviewed the documents and pulled more information from the data in order to clearly match the model given in the methodology with how these issues occurred during the study. Therefore, the findings are now in chronological order and match the flow of the model for easy reading and comprehension of the findings. Lastly, findings that did not pertain to the model or the question were taken out such as the information on the technology used for the VMM process.*

*A table was added in the findings to show what the mentee and mentor felt about the study. The qualitative open ended data was utilized for this portion. The information in this table was expounded upon in the findings to show how each participants’ perspective.*

*The portion on technology was taken out of the findings section. It was not germane to the 2 research questions. Plus each participant noted its impact if any on the mentoring and mentee process in the findings.*
>
>
> Conclusion - Comments
>
> Discussion, Implications
> :
>   This section is not well developed.  The summary appears to point to
> the value of videoconferencing for training purposes, but lacks a
> clear discussion of the use of videoconferencing for mentoring
> purposes.  Assuming these are two different things, the summary should
> be rewritten to better focus on the mentoring aspect as opposed to the training aspect.

***Authors’ Response****: The discussion portion now focuses solely on summarizing the research questions. Each research question is handled in individual paragraphs to help the reader understand the findings.*

*The implications are now in their own section and clearly relate next steps for a university or college interested in support new faculty in a VMM model.*
>
> Presentation - Comments
>
> Format, style, organization
> :
>   I would strongly encourage the researchers to use the following
> spellings throughout the paper:
> -Moodle (not MOODLE-see www.moodle.org<[http://www.moodle.org](https://webmail.moc.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=OnLvzZw3q0SRYxqS6weG_pFrbcUPztAIK3dxpi8cHkGPnGjtDBEmAgCIvWwH_Yq7nWoPF5ftLSE.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.moodle.org)>)
> -PowerPoint (not power point-see
> [http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/powerpoint/](https://webmail.moc.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=OnLvzZw3q0SRYxqS6weG_pFrbcUPztAIK3dxpi8cHkGPnGjtDBEmAgCIvWwH_Yq7nWoPF5ftLSE.&URL=http%3a%2f%2foffice.microsoft.com%2fen-us%2fpowerpoint%2f))
> -ipad (not Ipad-see [http://www.apple.com/ipad](https://webmail.moc.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=OnLvzZw3q0SRYxqS6weG_pFrbcUPztAIK3dxpi8cHkGPnGjtDBEmAgCIvWwH_Yq7nWoPF5ftLSE.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.apple.com%2fipad)) -YouTube (not
> youtube-see www.youtube.com<[http://www.youtube.com](https://webmail.moc.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=OnLvzZw3q0SRYxqS6weG_pFrbcUPztAIK3dxpi8cHkGPnGjtDBEmAgCIvWwH_Yq7nWoPF5ftLSE.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.youtube.com)>)
> -Flash (not Flash-see www.adobe.com/Flash<[http://www.adobe.com/Flash](https://webmail.moc.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=OnLvzZw3q0SRYxqS6weG_pFrbcUPztAIK3dxpi8cHkGPnGjtDBEmAgCIvWwH_Yq7nWoPF5ftLSE.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.adobe.com%2fflash)>)
>
> In two instances in the paper, the writers use "synchronized" where a
> form of the word "synchronous" is probably what they were meaning.
> These should be reviewed and corrected before publication.
>
> There are several instances where the initialization "ECE" is used in
> the study, but not definitive statement that the initials stand for
> "early childhood education." Likewise, on page 8 of the manuscript,
> the writers use "ECE education," a redundancy.

**Authors’ note**: Fixed spelling issue and ECE explanation.
>
> There is discrepancy in the use of "full-time" and "full time" (less
> the hyphen). These should be consistent.
>
> The paper would benefit from a close reading for punctuation,
> especially comma usage.
>
>
> Substance - Comments
>
> Detail, Length, Scope, Coverage
> :
>   No comments on this particular aspect. The study is an action
> research project with some implications for a broader community.

**Authors’ notes** – We noted that this is a case study and we added a section called “implications” and noted who the information was applicable to in the university setting.
>
> ------------------------------------------------------
>
> ------------------------------------------------------
> Reviewer B:
>
> Paper Number:
>   4004-12876-1
>
>
> Purpose - Comments
>
> Goals, Objectives, Rationale, Research Question, Hypothesis
> :
>   Rationale was clear. Definition of terms would be helpful.
>
>
> Background - Comments
>
> Theoretical Framework, Literature Review
> :
>   As you mentioned there is not much literature for this study. I do
> believe that you could have explained additional research regarding
> mentoring or videoconferencing even though it was not connected to the
> adjunct faculty context.

**Authors’ note**: We added a little more information on a mentor. But, since there is little literature on this topic, we did not add much on the context of an adjunct except to define it clearer for the reader.
>
>
> Methodology - Comments
>
> Participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis
> :
>   Methodology needs to be expanded to fully explain the data collected
> and the analysis.

**Authors’ note**: This portion was totally rewritten.
>
>
> Findings - Comments
>
> Data summaries, Statistical significance, assertions, themes
> :
>   I was not certain as to where the findings came from. A clearer
> explanation needs to be made as to which data provided the findings.

**Authors’ note**: We took the findings from the survey from each participant. We also show in the methodology what notes and information were taken during the study.
>
>
> Conclusion - Comments
>
> Discussion, Implications
> :
>   Good to include how the findings could be generalized across
> departments, schools, and colleges. Was this a specialized case since
> the adjunct was not fully qualified?

**Authors’ note**: We did clarify how the information could be generalized in the university setting. The adjunct was qualified and we noted that his area is psychology in the paper. But, he did not have experience with ECE educators.
>
>
> Presentation - Comments
>
> Format, style, organization
> :
>   Good flow, easy to read. I gave a few suggestions on organization of
> content in the attached document.
>
>
> Substance - Comments
>
> Detail, Length, Scope, Coverage
> :
>   I believe the study is extremely important; mentoring adjuncts is
> essential.
>
> ------------------------------------------------------
> jotlt.indiana.edu<[http://jotlt.indiana.edu](https://webmail.moc.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=OnLvzZw3q0SRYxqS6weG_pFrbcUPztAIK3dxpi8cHkGPnGjtDBEmAgCIvWwH_Yq7nWoPF5ftLSE.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fjotlt.indiana.edu)>
>
>